

## REMARKS

### STATUS OF THE SPECIFICATION

No amendments have been made to the Specification.

### STATUS OF THE DRAWINGS

No amendments have been made to the Drawings.

### STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-16, 19, 21-26, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,567,937 to Flores, et al. (hereinafter “Flores”). Claims 7-8, 17-18, and 27-28 were objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were otherwise allowable.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to include elements of allowable Claims 7, 17, and 27 respectively. Claims 7, 10, 17, 20, 27, and 30 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

### RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-16, 19, 21-26, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Flores. “Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention.” *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Articulate Systems, Inc.* 234 F.3d 14, 20, 57 USPQ2d 1057, 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

As noted in the office action, “Claims 7-8, 17-18, and 27-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” (Office Action, January 18, 2007, pg. 6).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation “**wherein the at least one context-sensitive resource comprises a pointer to a reference repository associated with the error event, the reference repository selected from the group consisting of computer system documentation, exception codes, previously reported problems, solutions to previously identified problems, and frequently asked questions**” from Claim 7. Claim 7 depended

directly upon independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent Claims 11 and 21 are also unanticipated by Flores for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 1. Applicants further assert that dependent Claims 2-6, 8-9, 12-16, 18-19, 22-26, and 28-29 are also allowable because of their dependence on allowable independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 respectively. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

### **CONCLUSION**

As a result of the presented amendments and remarks, Applicants assert that Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-16, 18-19, 21-26, and 28-29 with the current amendments, are patentable and in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required, the Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/David McKenzie/

Date: April 18, 2007

8 E. Broadway Suite 600

Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Telephone (801) 994-4646

David J. McKenzie

Reg. No. 46,919

Attorney for Applicants